



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,564	10/11/2001	Paul G. Allen	10003.001100 (digeo 129)	7500
32641	7590	11/17/2005	EXAMINER	
DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP 201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 ONE UTAH CENTER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/975,564	ALLEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nelson D. Hernandez	2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-19,21-24 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-19,21-24 and 26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Please note that the examiner of record has changed. All future correspondence should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose information is provided at the end of this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 10, line 19 – page 11, line 9 and page 12, line 14 – page 14, line 14, filed on September 19, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly prior art found.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye, US Patent 6,744,463 B2 in view of VanZeeland, US Patent 5,448,290.**

Regarding claim 1, Rye discloses a system (Fig. 1) for switching between a plurality of video cameras (Fig. 3, cameras 12a-12d) without a multiplexing device such

that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time (Col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 8; col. 2, lines 40-64; col. 4, line 9; col. 4, line 46; col. 5, line 61), the system comprising: a camera controller (Fig. 1: 38) for controlling the plurality of video cameras; a plurality of physically-separate, addressable power switches (addressable control modules 18a-18d shown in fig. 1), wherein each addressable power switch is coupled to and controls power applied to a corresponding video camera (Col. 3, lines 22-41), wherein the addressable power switches comprises a wireless receiver (Fig. 1: 24) for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch of power to the corresponding video camera; an output device (television receiver 34 in conjunction with video receiver 30 shown in fig. 1) capable of receiving a video signal from any of the plurality of video cameras and configured to output the video signal received; and a switch controller (Fig. 1: 40) controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable power switches, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter (Col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 8) for transmitting the control signals to the addressable power switches such that power is applied to only a single selected video camera (Col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 8; col. 2, lines 40-64; col. 4, line 9; col. 4, line 46; col. 5, line 61).

Although Rye discloses a wireless receiver for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch of power to the corresponding video camera, Rye does not explicitly disclose a different wireless receiver for each camera.

However, VanZeeland teaches a video security system (Fig. 3) for switching between a plurality of video cameras (See cameras 10 shown in fig. 3) without a

multiplexing device such that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time (Col. 6, lines 40-53), the system comprising: a camera controller (switching control box shown in fig. 3: 22') for controlling the plurality of video cameras; a plurality of different addressable transmitter/receivers (Fig. 3: 34), wherein each addressable transmitter/receiver is coupled to and controls transmission of image signals from each corresponding video camera (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53); an output device (monitor shown in fig. 3: 18) capable of receiving a video signal from any of the plurality of video cameras and configured to output the video signal received; and a switch controller (switching control box shown in fig. 3: 22') controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable transmitters/receivers, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter (Fig. 3: 34') for transmitting the control signals to the addressable transmitters/receivers such that image transmission is enable from only a single selected video camera. VanZeeland also teaches that when a specific camera needs to be controlled or monitored, the transmitters/receivers of the other cameras would be disabled (Col. 3, lines 15-29; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system taught in Rye by having a different addressable transmitter/receiver for receiving controls signals at each camera to select a particular camera for image transmission or camera control. The motivation to do so would have been to increase the flexibility of camera placement and relocation and to

select remotely a particular camera for viewing its video signal on the monitor or receive control signals to the camera as suggested by VanZeeland (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 5, line 2; col. 6, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 4, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as applied to claim 1 teaches that the wireless transmitter is configured to transmit radio frequency signals to the wireless receivers, and wherein the wireless receivers are configured to receive radiofrequency signals from the wireless transmitter (See Rye, col. 3, lines 64-67; see also VanZeeland, col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53).

Regarding claim 5, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as applied to claim 1 teaches that the switch controller is integrated into the camera controller (In Rye, the switch controller 40 is integrated into the camera controller 38 as shown in fig. 1; see also VanZeeland, fig. 3: 22').

Regarding claim 10, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as applied to claim 1 teaches that each of the plurality of video cameras comprises wireless transmitters for sending video signals to the output device, and wherein the output device comprises a wireless receiver for receiving video signals from the plurality of video cameras (See Rye, in fig. 1, each camera comprises a wireless transmitter (14a-14d) and the output device (monitor 34) comprises a wireless receiver 30; see also VanZeeland, transmitter/receivers 34 connected to each of the cameras 10 as shown in fig. 3).

Regarding claim 11, Rye discloses a camera controller (Fig. 1: 38) for switching between a plurality of video cameras (Fig. 3, cameras 12a-12d) without a multiplexing

device such that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time (Col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 8; col. 2, lines 40-64; col. 4, line 9; col. 4, line 46; col. 5, line 61), the camera controller comprising: a memory (Col. 4, lines 21-63) configured with a camera control process; a communication bus coupled to the memory for transmitting command codes from the camera control process (a communication bus is inherently included for transmitting command codes from the camera control process with the purpose of supplying addressing the specific camera for operation); and a switch controller (Fig. 1: 40) coupled to the communication bus for receiving the command codes, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter (Col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 8) for transmitting control signals to a wireless receiver (Fig. 1: 24) connected to a plurality of physically-separate, addressable power switches (addressable control modules 18a-18d shown in fig. 1) to either supply or switch off power to the plurality of video cameras such that power is applied to a single selected video camera; wherein the switch controller is configured to use the command codes to control the plurality of addressable power switches that control application of power to the plurality of video cameras, wherein the addressable power switches comprises a wireless receiver for receiving a control signal from the switch controller to either supply or switch off power to the corresponding video camera (Col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 8; col. 2, lines 40-64; col. 4, line 9; col. 4, line 46; col. 5, line 61).

Although Rye discloses a wireless receiver for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch off power to the corresponding video camera, Rye does not explicitly disclose a different wireless receiver for each camera.

However, VanZeeland teaches a video security system (Fig. 3) for switching between a plurality of video cameras (See cameras 10 shown in fig. 3) without a multiplexing device such that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time (Col. 6, lines 40-53), the system comprising: a camera controller (switching control box shown in fig. 3: 22') for controlling the plurality of video cameras; a plurality of different addressable transmitter/receivers (Fig. 3: 34), wherein each addressable transmitter/receiver is coupled to and controls transmission of image signals from each corresponding video camera (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53); an output device (monitor shown in fig. 3: 18) capable of receiving a video signal from any of the plurality of video cameras and configured to output the video signal received; and a switch controller (switching control box shown in fig. 3: 22') controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable transmitters/receivers, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter (Fig. 3: 34') for transmitting the control signals to the addressable transmitters/receivers such that image transmission is enable from only a single selected video camera. VanZeeland also teaches that when a specific camera needs to be controlled or monitored, the transmitters/receivers of the other cameras would be disabled (Col. 3, lines 15-29; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system taught in Rye by having a different addressable transmitter/receiver for receiving controls signals at each camera to select

a particular camera for image transmission or camera control. The motivation to do so would have been to increase the flexibility of camera placement and relocation and to select remotely a particular camera for viewing its video signal on the monitor or receive control signals to the camera as suggested by VanZeeland (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 5, line 2; col. 6, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 14, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as applied to claim 11 teaches that the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter for transmitting control signals to the plurality of addressable power switches (See Rye, Col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 8; see also VanZeeland, in fig. 3 the controller 22 comprises a wireless transmitter 34' for transmitting control signals to the plurality of cameras).

Regarding claim 15, Rye discloses a decoder for decoding the command codes to generate the control signals (Col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 8).

Regarding claim 26, Rye teaches that at least one addressable power switch is to supply or switch off power from a DC source (Col. 3, lines 42-55).

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye, US Patent 6,744,463 B2 in view of VanZeeland, US Patent 5,448,290 and further in view of Abe, US Patent 6,052,509.

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland teaches the use of addressable power switch for turning on and off each camera but fails to teach that said switches are embedded within a corresponding video camera.

However, Abe teaches an camera (Fig. 1: 10) that can be remotely controlled by a body portion (Fig. 1: 40), said camera comprises a wireless signal transmitting circuit

(Fig. 1: 20), a wireless signal receiving circuit (Fig. 1: 24) and a power supply (Fig. 1: 30) embedded within the camera (See fig. 1) (Col. 4, lines 36-67; col. 5, lines 22-52; col. 6, lines 13-52). Abe also teaches that the body portion sends control commands to the camera for controlling a zooming operation, a focusing operation, an exposure, a shooting direction, and to turn on or off said camera (Col. 6, lines 13-29) (By teaching the power switch is integrated inside the camera, Abe teaches a remotely controlled power switch that is embedded within a camera).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Abe as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the concept taught by Abe and modify the system taught in Rye and VanZeeland by having the addressable power switch embedded within the video camera. The motivation to do so would help to minimize the number of components in the video camera system in Rye and VanZeeland, thus, by making the camera and addressable power switch integrated the size of each camera system and cost can be reduced significantly.

6. Claims 6, 7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye, US Patent 6,744,463 B2 in view of VanZeeland, US Patent 5,448,290 and further in view of Ogasawara, US Patent 6,543,052 B1.

Regarding claim 6, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland fails to teach that the camera controller is integrated into customer premises equipment that is communicatively coupled to a cable network.

However, Ogasawara teaches a set-top box (STB) which is coupled to cable providers, Internet Service Provider (ISP), over-the-air broadcast, etc. (Col. 3, lines 52-65), and is also capable of controlling various peripheral devices such as a camera printer, etc. (See fig. 1). Ogasawara also teaches that by controlling the peripheral devices using a centralized control through the STB helps facilitate their access and management (Col. 4, lines 1-3). This would be advantageous in the system taught in Rye and VanZeeland for controlling the plurality of cameras by using an STB such that all devices may be controlled along with a variety of other devices and providers. The STB also gives the system versatility by including cable connections as well as Internet service for transmitting and receiving video images from remote locations.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Ogasawara as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the controller taught in Rye and VanZeeland into a customer premises equipment (such as a STB) that is communicatively coupled to a cable network for producing a multifaceted device capable of transmitting and receiving information.

Regarding claim 7, limitations can be found in claim 6.

Regarding claim 16 and 17, limitations can be found in claim 6.

Regarding claim 18, limitations can be found in claim 6.

7. Claims 8, 9, 12 are 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye, US Patent 6,744,463 B2 and VanZeeland, US Patent

5,448,290 in view of Ogasawara, US Patent 6,543,052 B1 and further in view of Bellman, US Patent 4,831,438.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Ogasawara fails to teach that an authentication process limits commands accepted to only authorized commands or an encryption process provides security to video signals transmitted from the camera controller to a remote access controller.

However, Bellman teaches that is notoriously well known in the art to have a surveillance system that includes an authentication process (Col. 4, lines 39-61) and an encryption process (Fig. 1: 470; col. 4, lines 13-61). This would help preventing unauthorized activation of the system or interception of the surveillance information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Rye, VanZeeland and Ogasawara by providing secure access to the surveillance system by using authentication and encryption processes, thus the system would obtain increased protection against unauthorized users.

Regarding claim 12 and 13, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Ogasawara fails to teach that the memory is further configured with an authentication process for authenticating remote commands to control the plurality of cameras and an encryption process to securely transmit video from the camera controller to a requesting controller.

However, Bellman teaches that is notoriously well known in the art to have a surveillance system that includes an authentication process (Col. 4, lines 39-61) and an encryption process (Fig. 1: 470; col. 4, lines 13-61). This would help preventing unauthorized activation of the system or interception of the surveillance information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Rye, VanZeeland and Ogasawara by providing secure access to the surveillance system by using authentication and encryption processes, thus the system would obtain increased protection against unauthorized users.

Although Bellman fails to explicitly teach that a memory is configured with the authentication process and encryption process, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would be essential to store these processes in a storage area for storing program codes needed to activate each process for securing access in surveillance systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the memory for storing an authentication and encryption processes.

8. Claims 19, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye, US Patent 6,744,463 B2 in view of VanZeeland, US Patent 5,448,290 and further in view of Bellman, US Patent 4,831,438.

Regarding claim 19, Rye discloses a method for switching between a plurality of video cameras (Fig. 3, cameras 12a-12d) without a multiplexing device such that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time, the method comprising: generating a control code and communicating the control code

to a power switch controller decoding the control code to generate control signals, wherein the control signals are configured such that power is applied to a single video camera at a time (Col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 8); and transmitting the control signals wirelessly to a wireless receiver (Fig. 1: 24) within a plurality of physically-separate, addressable power switches (addressable control modules 18a-18d shown in fig. 1), wherein each addressable power switch is coupled to and controls power applied a corresponding video camera by either supplying or switching off power responsive to the control signals (Col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 8; col. 2, lines 40-64; col. 4, line 9; col. 4, line 46; col. 5, line 61).

Although Rye discloses a wireless receiver for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch off power to the corresponding video camera, Rye does not explicitly disclose different wireless receivers within a plurality of addressable power switches and processing a command to view images from a particular camera of the plurality of video cameras to determine if the command is authorized and if the command is authorized, then generating a control code and communicating the control code to a power switch controller decoding the control code to generate control signals, wherein the control signals are configured such that power is applied to a single video camera at a time.

However, VanZeeland teaches a video security system (Fig. 3) for switching between a plurality of video cameras (See cameras 10 shown in fig. 3) without a multiplexing device such that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time (Col. 6, lines 40-53), the system comprising: a

camera controller (switching control box shown in fig. 3: 22') for controlling the plurality of video cameras; a plurality of different addressable transmitter/receivers (Fig. 3: 34), wherein each addressable transmitter/receiver is coupled to and controls transmission of image signals from each corresponding video camera (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53); an output device (monitor shown in fig. 3: 18) capable of receiving a video signal from any of the plurality of video cameras and configured to output the video signal received; and a switch controller (switching control box shown in fig. 3: 22') controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable transmitters/receivers, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter (Fig. 3: 34') for transmitting the control signals to the addressable transmitters/receivers such that image transmission is enable from only a single selected video camera.

VanZeeland also teaches that when a specific camera needs to be controlled or monitored, the transmitters/receivers of the other cameras would be disabled (Col. 3, lines 15-29; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system taught in Rye by having a different addressable transmitter/receiver for receiving controls signals at each camera to select a particular camera for image transmission or camera control. The motivation to do so would have been to increase the flexibility of camera placement and relocation and to select remotely a particular camera for viewing its video signal on the monitor or receive

control signals to the camera as suggested by VanZeeland (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 5, line 2; col. 6, lines 45-49).

The combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland fails to teach processing a command to view images from a particular camera of the plurality of video cameras to determine if the command is authorized and if the command is authorized, then generating a control code and communicating the control code to a power switch controller decoding the control code to generate control signals, wherein the control signals are configured such that power is applied to a single video camera at a time.

However, Bellman teaches that is notoriously well known in the art to have a surveillance system that includes an authentication process (Col. 4, lines 39-61) and an encryption process (Fig. 1: 470; col. 4, lines 13-61). This would help preventing unauthorized activation of the system or interception of the surveillance information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Rye and VanZeeland by providing secure access to the surveillance system by using authentication and encryption processes, thus the system would obtain increased protection against unauthorized users.

Regarding claim 21, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Bellman as applied to claim 19 teaches that the transmitting occurs by sending control signals over a radio frequency carrier from the power switch controller to the addressable power switches (See Rye, col. 3, lines 64-67; see also VanZeeland, col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 53).

Regarding claim 24, claim 24 is an apparatus for the method in claim 21. The combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Bellman teaches the limitations as in claim 21 (See grounds for rejecting claim 21).

9. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye, US Patent 6,744,463 B2 and VanZeeland, US Patent 5,448,290 in view of Bellman, US Patent 4,831,438 and further in view of Ogasawara, US Patent 6,543,052 B1.

Regarding claims 22 and 23, the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Bellman fails to teach that the plurality of cameras are placed about a premises of a customer and wherein the command is received from a local system within the premises of the customer or a remote system outside the premises of the costumer.

However, Ogasawara teaches a set-top box (STB) which is coupled to cable providers, Internet Service Provider (ISP), over-the-air broadcast, etc. (Col. 3, lines 52-65), and is also capable of controlling various peripheral devices such as a camera printer, etc. (See fig. 1). Ogasawara also teaches that by controlling the peripheral devices using a centralized control through the STB helps facilitate their access and management (Col. 4, lines 1-3). This would be advantageous in the system taught in Rye and VanZeeland for controlling the plurality of cameras by using an STB such that all devices may be controlled along with a variety of other devices and providers. The STB also gives the system versatility by including cable connections as well as Internet service for transmitting and receiving video images from remote locations.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Rye in view of VanZeeland and further in view of Ogasawara as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the controller taught in Rye and VanZeeland into a customer premises equipment (such as a STB) that is communicatively coupled to a cable network for producing a multifaceted device capable of transmitting and receiving information.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc Yen Vu can be reached on (571) 272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2612

NDHH
November 7, 2005



NGOC YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER